

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 9-12, 14-16, 18-22, 24-26, 28-32, 34-36, and 38-39 are currently pending in this application. Claims 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 24, 26, 28, 29, 34, 36, and 28 are currently amended. Claims 13, 17, 23, 27, 33, and 27 are currently canceled.

**Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to claims 27 because of informalities. Claim 27 canceled. The withdrawal of the objection to the claims 27 is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 9-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,150,361 to Wieczorek et al. (hereinafter Wieczorek).

Independent claim 9 as amended recites "a plurality of circuit components configured to operate in a plurality of signal processing states, each of the plurality of signal processing states having an on power consumption level, an off power consumption level, and at least one intermediate power consumption level for at least one of the plurality of circuit components on a call state basis." Accordingly, at least three power consumption levels are associated with a component on a call state basis.

Wieczorek teaches adjusting operational modes of a communication unit as follows:

According to the invention, the communication unit may be made to function in one of two operational mode: a low power or energy saving mode and a high power or non energy saving mode. (*see Wieczorek, column 5, lines 4-7, emphasis added.*)

Wieczorek clearly teaches only two modes of operation. Wieczorek further teaches, and the Examiner specifically relies on, the following:

To conserve energy, both the transmitter 324 and the D/A 322 are deactivated (326) by the controller 320 unless the communication is transmitting. (*see Wieczorek, column 4, lines 24-27.*)

These two citations make it clear that Wieczorek teaches only two modes of operation, a low power mode (deactivated) and a high power mode (activated).

In order to anticipate a claim, a cited reference must teach each and every element of the claim. (*See MPEP §2131, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."* *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).) For at least the reason presented above, Wieczorek fails to anticipate independent claim 9.

In rejecting now canceled claim 13, the Examiner opined that Wieczorek discloses three signal processing states and associated power consumption levels (*see Office Action, page 5*). However, as the above cited passage of Wieczorek

unequivocally states, only two operational modes are taught. While claim 13 is now canceled, independent claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 13.

Further, dependent claim 18 recites the plurality of circuit components transitions between at least two power consumption levels during any single time slot. The Examiner, in rejecting claim 18, cites the following portion of Wieczorek:

Ultimately, the properly coded and slot and frame synchronized information signal routed from the RF transceiver 324 to the antenna switch 303, which is controlled (33) by the controller 320 to selectively couple the transmitter 324 to the antenna 302 so that the signal that may be appropriately radiated to cause transmission of the processed signal as desired. Alternately, a duplexer could be used in place of the antenna switch 303 as is known in the art. (see Wieczorek, column 4, lines 30-38.)

The duplexer disclosed by Wieczorek is simply a switch that couples a transmitter and a receiver to an antenna. As is clear from the expanded citation shown above, the duplexer of Wieczorek does not teach full-duplex communication in which both transmit and receive functions are carried out within a single timeslot. Nor does the duplexer of Wieczorek teach or suggest transitioning components between power consumption levels during a single timeslot, as claimed in claim 18.

Independent method claim 19 and processor claim 29 recite a similar limitation as independent claim 9. Claims 20-22, 24-26, 28-32, 34-36, and 38-39

**Applicant:** Kaewell et al.  
**Application No.:** 10/757,222

depend from claims 19 and 29. For the reasons presented above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claim 9-39.

**Conclusion**

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephonic interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

John David Kaewell Jr. et al.

By   
Robert D. Leonard  
Registration No. 57,204

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza, Suite 1600  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-6400  
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499  
RDL/kmc